

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on April 11, 2007.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 15 and 31-53 are currently pending in this application. Claims 15 and 42 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 15 and 42.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15 and 31-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041 ("Knudson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 ("Alexander"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, the independent claims of the present application have been amended to recite payment steps carried out in response to a positive response to the interactive message. Applicant respectfully asserts that the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims.

As discussed with the Examiner during the Examiner Interview conducted on April 11, 2007, both Knudson and Alexander fail to teach or suggest carrying out payment steps in response to a positive reply to an interactive message. In fact, as admitted by the Examiner, Alexander is completely silent with respect to payment steps of any kind. Further, while Knudson discloses pay-per-view programs and payments steps in relation to ordering pay-per-view programs, Knudson fails to explicitly teach or suggest payment steps that are carried out

with respect to a positive reply to an interactive message generated by a decoder. In fact, Knudson does not even mention an interactive message, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies solely on Alexander as teaching an interactive message (*see* Office Action mailed November 24, 2006, pages 4-5).

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 15 and 42 are patentable over Knudson and Alexander, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/019001).

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant